

THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY REPORTER.

UNDER THE SANCTION OF THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

CXIII. VOL. V.—No. 7.]

LONDON: WEDNESDAY, APRIL 3RD, 1844.

[PRICE 4d.

THE SUGAR QUESTION.

THE course which the Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-slavery Society have deemed it their duty to pursue in relation to the question of reducing the duty on slave-grown sugar, has become the occasion of a Circular, which has been issued by some valued supporters of the Anti-slavery cause, and which will doubtless engage much of the attention of its friends at large. It is as follows:—

TO THE FRIENDS OF THE NEGRO, AND TO ALL WHO WERE INSTRUMENTAL IN PROCURING THE ABOLITION OF SLAVERY IN THE BRITISH COLONIES.

We, whose names are affixed to this document, believe it due, no less to the great cause of universal freedom and justice, than to our own character, to submit to the friends of the negro race, and to all those with whom we have been accustomed to unite in anti-slavery efforts, the following statement of the reasons which have induced us to dissent from the proceedings of the London Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-slavery Society in reference to the question of introducing foreign sugars into this country.

It will be in the recollection of most of you, that in the year 1841 a proposition was submitted to Parliament to reduce the prohibitory duty on foreign sugars, and to admit them for consumption in this country. This proposition met with a most violent opposition from all those who supposed their interests would suffer by the abolition or curtailment of the monopoly of the British market possessed by the Colonial sugar-growers; and the London Anti-slavery Committee, in pursuance of what they deemed their duty to their constituents, and in furtherance of what they judged to be the interests of the great principles they are appointed to defend, memorialized the Government against any relaxation of the duties upon slave-grown sugar.

By their influence, united with that of the British sugar-grower, the proposed measure of relaxation was successfully resisted.

Very serious consequences have resulted from the course which the Committee have taken. In the first place, a schism has been created in the ranks of the anti-slavery friends in this country. The London Committee acted without the consent or approval of many of the most influential provincial associations, several of which immediately protested against the course taken.

Amongst these, we believe, were the associations at Kendal, Liverpool, Manchester, Birmingham, Devizes, Hitchin, and Glasgow; and there are good grounds for believing that great doubt was entertained by many others of the wisdom of the step taken by the London Committee.

As an inevitable result of this, it may be stated that the London Committee has not since so fully enjoyed the confidence of the anti-slavery public as is necessary for the successful prosecution of its labours.

We are anxious to submit to your candid consideration our objections to the course taken by the London Committee.

In the first place, we are conscientiously opposed to the means resorted to for effecting its object, as involving an infringement of the sacred rights of justice, and requiring for its successful accomplishment the use of physical force.

And, secondly, we are of opinion that the righteous object sought to be obtained by the Committee will not by their plan of operations be achieved, but that to persevere in the use of such means will greatly tend to injure the anti-slavery cause.

In considering the first objection, it is of importance to ask—Who are the men who object to our receiving slave-grown sugar? Not the poor, but a small, very small minority of the more comfortable or richer classes. It is a few of these who have conscientious scruples against permitting slave-grown sugar to come into consumption in this country; and for the sake of these scruples, in which the millions do not participate, the latter are condemned to give up to a great extent the use of sugar. Our own colonies produce enough to supply those who can pay the high price they charge for their sugar, and these, consequently, get enough; but the poor go without, to satisfy the scruples of those who, under any circumstances, know nothing of scarcity. We feel constrained to put it to the latter, whether their conscientious scruples ought to impose sacrifices upon their poorer countrymen, who do not partake of their scruples?

To us it appears more just to permit importation freely; and then, where conscience forbids the use of slave produce, to indulge only in the consumption of that which is grown by free labour.

To doom millions to involuntary abstinence and suffering, because a few, and an almost imperceptible fraction, of the people have honest objections against the use of slave-grown sugar, appears to us to be the subjecting of one man's clearest natural right to the arbitrary decision of another man's conscience, and wholly indefensible on any ground, social, political, or religious.

And we may here observe, that the plan of action laid down at

the formation of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society recognized only such means as were consistent with moral, peaceable, and Christian principles: all other measures are expressly excluded. The application to Government to interfere by fiscal regulations is one which can only be successful by a violation of those great principles. If the legislature maintain a prohibition against foreign sugar, how does it maintain it? Clearly, not by the voluntary co-operation of the consumers of sugar in this country, but by a preventive force of revenue cruisers and armed blockade men. No man will assert that, if government force were removed, Brazilian and other foreign sugar would not come freely into the British market.

The few who have any scruples against using it are as nothing amongst the twenty-seven millions of our population, and the great bulk of the people are, beyond a doubt, anxious to be supplied with a larger quantity of sugar. To maintain this fiscal regulation and prohibition, *force* is absolutely necessary; and, in demanding such prohibition at the hands of Government, the London Committee virtually demands the employment of force. And what has experience taught us are the benefits of the employment of *force* to put down slavery? The ships of war on the coast of Africa have done little, perhaps nothing, to suppress the slave trade; but they have done much to increase its horrors, and to add to the tortures of the unhappy Africans, whom cupidity has snatched from their native land. All employment of *force*, thus far, has proved useless, and worse than useless; and it is time the friends of the negro exhibited more confidence in the great Christian principles upon which alone their movement should be based, and by the progress of which alone it can ever triumph.

Having thus briefly stated our reasons for believing that the London Committee, in calling in the aid of coercive Government measures, has unconsciously adopted a course involving principles of action at variance with justice and humanity, let us, in the second place, consider its probable effects upon the great and holy cause in which we are all equally interested.

Let us direct our attention more particularly to the Brazilian Empire, where slavery and the slave trade are maintained in connexion with the cultivation of sugar to a larger extent probably than in all the world besides. The circumstances of the Brazilian Empire are such as to make it impossible that any Emperor or statesman of that country can, of his own will, at once destroy a system so long existing, and so interwoven with the habits, feelings, prejudices, institutions, and fancied interests of the people.

Slavery in the Brazils can only be abolished in one of two ways: by social convulsion and violent revolution; or by a change in public opinion on the question itself. The first mode all good men would dread; for what can be more terrible than the uprising of an ignorant and exasperated slave population, spreading horror, and crime, and devastation, not surpassed even by the terrors of slavery itself? The second mode is the only one to be hoped for, and that can never be brought about by aggravating distinctions in our commercial code.

English anti-slavery opinion may operate powerfully upon Brazilian slavery opinion. But, to act at all, it must not only exist, it must have a medium through which it can act. The more our intercourse with the Brazils is encouraged, the more powerfully will our opinions act upon their opinions, and the more likely shall we be to urge them to a wiser policy. Offer them advice in a hostile shape, send it to them on the bayonet's point, or in a vexatious and injurious tariff, and it is rejected with feelings of exasperation and contempt; but convey it in kindly terms, through the channel of trade and of mutual dependence, and it will come attended with all the circumstances which can give inducement to its cordial acceptance.

So long as our interference with the institutions of Brazil is confined to the benevolent exertions of individuals, or of Anti-slavery Societies, we may hope to find a sympathetic response from the philanthropists in that country; but the moment we call in the aid of Government the spirit of nationality is roused, and the Brazilians are excited by their pro-slavery party to view with suspicion and jealousy such an attack upon their independence. If we would fully estimate the injurious tendency of this policy, let us suppose that, at the time when slavery existed in the British dominions, the Government of Russia had threatened, through its diplomats, to coerce us into an act of justice to our negro population; would that have aided the efforts of our abolitionists? On the contrary, would it not have afforded the best possible opportunity to our West India interest for an appeal to the patriotism of the English people to resist the menaces of foreigners; and would not the question of slavery have been lost in the indignation excited against the arrogant dictation of Russia?

That similar passions are fostered in foreign slave states by our diplomatic intervention in their affairs, is shown by the correspondence upon the subject of slavery between our Government and that

of Spain, by the debates in the legislatures of Brazil and of the United States, and by the newspaper press of those countries.

But there is another, and perhaps still more forcible, objection to our calling on Government to resort to fiscal restrictions for coercing foreign countries into the suppression of slavery.

This policy is maintained by our statesmen upon the plea that the free-labour sugar of our colonies cannot compete in price with the produce of slaves.

This is their avowed motive for excluding Brazilian sugar from consumption in this country; and it has naturally imparted the colour of selfishness to their policy, and has led foreigners to regard the anti-slavery arguments which they have borrowed for the occasion from the London Committee as mere pretences for upholding the interests of the West India monopolists, upon whose support the Government of the day depends to some extent for its existence. This has given to the slave-owner in Brazil and elsewhere the power of appealing to the selfishness of the consumers of sugar, by pointing to the effects of emancipation in England, and saying to their countrymen, "Behold the failure of the great experiment of abolition! The advocates of freedom for the slave promised the British people that free labour should be found cheaper than slave labour, and now they are made to pay for that sugar double the price at which you are supplied by us."

Nothing has, probably, been more fatal to the interests of freedom than the assumption, in our opinion utterly unfounded, that the labour of slaves is cheaper than that of freemen. It has arrayed the consumer of tropical productions against the cause we have at heart, and thus placed the most powerful barrier—man's interest and selfishness—in the path of negro emancipation.

We entreat your earnest attention to this point, upon the solution of which depends, in a great degree, the triumph or failure of your efforts to abolish slavery throughout the world.

Let it be premised, and always carefully borne in mind, that *our fiscal laws exclude all foreign sugars, whether the produce of freemen or slaves; that the present virtually prohibitory duty was imposed prior to the emancipation of our slaves, and that it was imposed, not for the purpose (now avowed) of excluding slave-grown produce, but to secure a monopoly of this market to the then slave-owners of our own colonies.*

The question at issue is not, therefore, as has been systematically made to appear, whether, with open ports to all sugars at the same duty, the West Indians could now compete in this market with the Brazilians, but whether free labour in any part of the world is cheaper than the labour of slaves. We are by no means prepared to admit that even the free population of the West India islands are incompetent, with a more wise application of capital and labour, to produce sugar as cheaply as the Brazilian planter. Our colonists have long enjoyed a monopoly of the English market. We all know the blighting effects of monopoly upon skill, enterprise, and improvement, and nowhere has its withering influence been more fatally felt than in the colonies of Great Britain. To pretend to decide what may be done by the West Indians in future, under the stimulus of free trade, from the experience of the past, would be to disregard that chief incentive to all improvement—competition. Already, under the apprehension only of the possible loss of their monopoly, they have entered upon the march of improvement. By a late arrival, the Governor of Jamaica has given us the gratifying assurance that, by the adoption of improved modes of cultivation, such as the use of the plough, &c., fifty per cent. more produce may be raised—a mere foretaste, as we believe, of that which future efforts will accomplish. But the question really at issue is, whether slave labour may not be rendered unprofitable, if subjected to competition with free labour under the most favourable circumstances. It was the well-known opinion of that benevolent and intelligent man, the late James Cropper, that, if sugar were cultivated in the East, it would be the means of abolishing slavery in the West. The rapid increase which has lately taken place in the cultivation of the sugar-cane in our Eastern possessions tends to corroborate that opinion.

But, as the sugar of the East Indies enjoys the same monopoly of our market as that of the West Indies, the experiment has yet to be tried in competition with the produce of Brazil; nor can it be fairly tried, until the sugar of the world is admitted into this country at one uniform duty.

In many parts of the East the wages of labour do not exceed 1*d.* or 2*d.* per day, less than one half of the lowest estimate we have ever heard of the daily cost of a slave in Cuba or Brazil. Admit then, we say, the sugar of China, Siam, Java, Cochin China, and Manilla, as well as of the Western Islands, Peru, and every other country, into fair and equal competition with the produce of Brazil, and let it be seen whether we cannot destroy slavery by underselling it. Let this be done, in the full faith that Divine Providence has ordained that the greatest abundance and cheapness of his bounties shall be the reward of those who "do unto others as they would that others should do unto them;" and, with His blessing, the evil of slavery shall be for ever destroyed, by the most peaceful, safe, and effectual method of rendering it no longer profitable to wicked men to enslave and oppress their fellow-creatures. By this course we shall free ourselves in the eyes of the world from the imputation of selfishness, and no longer be suspected by the slave-owning communities as the supporters of monopoly in the West Indies.

We have thus endeavoured briefly to convey to you the principal grounds of our dissent from the course taken by our friends and coadjutors in the anti-slavery cause; and we fervently hope that they may be induced to reconsider their opinion and retrace their

steps. We cannot express the pain we have felt when we have viewed the course taken by the executive committee of a society whose object is so noble as that of promoting the abolition of slavery throughout the world.

We have seen this policy, begun we believe in error, persevered in with a pertinacity wholly unaccountable. We have heard it advanced as a powerful and conclusive argument by men in the Legislature of our country, who in former years were known only as the determined friends of slavery in its worst form.

We have perceived its effect upon the public mind, and the mode in which it has impaired the influence of the once powerful creators and directors of British anti-slavery opinion; we have observed with regret the secession of many associations whose co-operation and exertions had done so much to secure the triumph of justice in our own colonies; and, seeing all this, and feeling deeply concerned on account of it, we are constrained to attempt the restoration of British anti-slavery effort to the better position it enjoyed before this almost fatal error was committed.

SIR,—We, the undersigned, having been appointed by those Members of the Anti-Slavery Convention, held in London in June, 1843, who disapproved of the steps taken by certain Members of the London Committee of the Anti-Slavery Society, in opposing the introduction of foreign sugar on the same terms as the produce of our own colonies, beg to call your attention to the accompanying Address. Should the sentiments therein contained meet your approval, we shall feel obliged by your permission to affix your name to it, in addition to our own signatures. The discussion on the Sugar Duties, which is to come on during the present session, renders it of peculiar importance that we should remove the impression made upon the House of Commons by the recent assertion of Sir Robert Peel, that the Anti-Slavery Society is in favour of the existing monopoly; by which assertion, we are made instrumental in depriving the people of England of the great advantage of cheap sugar.

THOMAS SPENCER,
W. T. BLAIR,
G. W. ANSTIE.

Please to send a reply before the 1st of April, to Rev. T. Spencer, Hinton, near Bath.

The issuing of this circular has given rise to a reply from Mr. Sturge, after the following tenor:—

To THOMAS SPENCER, WILLIAM T. BLAIR, AND GEORGE W. ANSTIE.

Edgbaston, Birmingham, 3rd Month, 23rd, 1844.

DEAR FRIENDS,—I have this week received a note from you, accompanying a circular addressed "To the friends of the Negro, and to all who were instrumental in procuring the Abolition of Slavery in the British Colonies." I have read both with surprise and pain. My entire confidence in your fairness and candour compels me to conclude, that you would not have given the sanction of your names to documents so full of injustice to the Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, had you compared the statements with the facts on which they profess to proceed.

The case stands thus:—The British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society was established in the spring of 1839. It originated in a conference held in London, to which every gentleman known to have taken an active part in the abolition of slavery in the British colonies was invited. The following was unanimously adopted by the conference, as a fundamental principle of action:—

"That, so long as slavery exists, there is no reasonable prospect of the annihilation of the slave trade, and of extinguishing the sale and barter of human beings."

And as a leading means of obtaining this object, it was also unanimously resolved,

"To recommend the use of free-grown produce, as far as practicable, in preference to slave-grown, and to promote the adoption of fiscal regulations in favour of free labour."

To carry out these views the committee accepted their appointment. That committee resolved to convene an anti-slavery convention in 1840, to which they invited abolition delegates from various parts of the world. The attendance at that convention exceeded their most sanguine expectations; and not only was there no objection then raised to the constitution of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, but, during its sittings, a motion having been introduced into the House of Commons for the reduction of the duty on slave-grown sugar, the Convention, in reference to that motion, unanimously passed the following resolution:

"That, impressed with the importance of avoiding all means of strengthening slavery and the foreign slave trade, this Convention is of the judgment that the British Government ought on no account to allow of the introduction of slave-grown sugar into the British market; and that the friends of the abolition of slavery ought, in their individual character, to uphold this view."

In the spring of 1841 it was supposed that a similar measure was contemplated by Government; and the Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society presented a memorial to Lord Melbourne on the 2nd of April, urging the continued exclusion of slave-grown produce, but at the same time advocating the unrestricted admission of foreign sugars raised by free labour. These facts were before the public for a considerable time, but not a single objection was raised, until the sugar duties became part of a question on which the existence of the Whig government was staked. The subject

was also mixed up with the general question of free trade, and then for the first time the proceedings of the Committee were called in question. They were censured by many of their country friends, but vindicated themselves by a statement of the foregoing and other facts, published in the *Anti-Slavery Reporter* of May 19th, 1841.

However you may have altered your opinion as to the principle on which the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society is founded, you must admit that the Committee of that Society, so far from being the cause of a schism in the Anti-Slavery ranks, have acted in strict accordance with the duty imposed upon them by the constitution of the Society, and the resolution of the Convention of 1840. They have only been able to ascertain that four Anti-Slavery Associations, out of the large number existing in Great Britain and Ireland, have ever intimated their dissent from the views entertained by the Committee on the introduction of the slave-grown produce of Cuba and Brazil into the British markets. One of these, that of Birmingham, has reviewed the subject, and returned to the ground taken by the London Committee. In reference to another, that of Liverpool, though there was a large majority of its Committee, no doubt, in favour of your view, yet several of the minority sent the London Committee letters of protest against the course taken by the majority. On the other hand, the conduct of the Committee was fully approved by many local associations.

In the documents you have just circulated, permit me to say, an incorrect impression is conveyed in the statement that the Committee are "opposed to the introduction of foreign sugar on the same terms as the produce of our own colonies." So far from this, they have uniformly and strenuously advocated the introduction of sugar from all parts of the world into the British market, provided it were the produce of *free* and not of *slave* labour. This fact is proved by every document issued by the Committee on the subject, including the one read by Sir Robert Peel in the House of Commons, on the evening of the 7th instant.

A second Convention was held in 1843, constituted, like the former, of delegates from anti-slavery bodies in this and other countries. If any doubt had existed of the conduct of the Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society having secured the confidence of the anti-slavery public, that doubt must have been dispelled by the large and influential character of the assembly which, at their invitation, met on that occasion.

Though I do not admit that the soundness of great principles is to be tested by the number or station of their supporters, yet the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society might appeal to the support they have received, in confirmation of the inaccuracy of your statement that they have paralyzed their influence by the course they have pursued. Not only have two Conventions met, at the invitation of the Committee, which might fairly be said to include a representation of the anti-slavery feeling of the civilized world, but the Committee have been annually and unanimously appointed to their office by public meetings at Exeter-hall, which will at least bear comparison with any others for benevolent objects. At that held shortly after the formation of the African Civilization Society, from which we dissent on vital points, the Duke of Sussex presided, the Ambassador, now the Prime Minister, of France took part in the proceedings, and there were present not only the venerable Thomas Clarkson, and the leading abolitionists from different parts of the United Kingdom, but such an assembly of the friends of the cause from different parts of the world as had never met on any former occasion.

In anticipating the possibility of an immediate abolition of slavery, I am grieved at your expression of an apprehension of the "uprising of an ignorant and exasperated slave-population, spreading horror, and crime, and devastation, not surpassed even by the terrors of slavery itself." Such language, you will recollect, was used by the supporters of slavery in the British colonies against the advocates of immediate emancipation, and by such groundless fears I believe the attainment of our object was very greatly retarded.

You assert that the course pursued by the Society involves a violation of the pacific principles on which it is based. I cannot admit this, although most decidedly of the opinion that the suppression of the slave-trade by armed cruisers is alike ineffectual and inconsistent with Christian principle. I have yet to learn, that fiscal regulations to prevent the sale of stolen property require to be enforced by the sacrifice of human life.

I also maintain, that the unrequited toil of the slave is at the outset a violation of every principle of free trade.

Those who have advocated the cheapness of free over slave labour—the circumstances being equal—have ever admitted that the slave-dealer, by seizing on rich virgin soil, and by an unsparing waste of human life in its cultivation, may for a time obtain larger returns than can be secured by labour without coercion.

Past experience assures me that I should be doing injustice to the working classes of this country, did I believe that, if they knew half the misery occasioned by the use of sugar supplied by the slave-trade and slavery, they would wish to consume it at any reduction of price.

I entirely dissent from the opinion that our moral influence can be beneficial to slaveholders, if we participate in their crimes. It is well known that a large part of the produce now shipped from the Brazils and Cuba to the bonded warehouses in England, is to meet bills drawn at long dates, for goods which have been sent from this country to Havana and Rio Janeiro, to be shipped from thence in barter for slaves; and the recent trial of Zulueta

has proved that the slave-trade is mainly sustained by British capital.

As a further illustration of this, I may mention that I was told by a gentleman largely concerned in the manufactures of this country, and on whose veracity I can fully rely, that, in passing through the establishment of a friend of his (a Member of Parliament), he observed an article known to be prepared for barter for slaves, and remarked to him, "I see you are in the slave-trade." This he admitted, and confirmed the fact by saying, that his house had lately made a bad debt of considerable amount in consequence of the capture of a slaver by our cruisers, on the sale of whose human cargo the payment of the money depended. I would appeal to your candid opinion, as to what would be the moral effect of adopting a course which would inevitably lead to the increase of similar transactions to an unlimited extent, and in the guilt of which Englishmen would be not only individually but nationally involved.

In conclusion, I fully admit that it is far less important to show that the Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society have acted consistently with the principles laid down for their guidance, than to prove that these principles are correct. We shall all agree that a right decision upon this question must have a powerful influence for good or evil on the cause of emancipation throughout the world, and I would earnestly implore you, and every other true friend of the slave, deeply and fully to consider the documents you have issued before you finally adopt their views.

I greatly regret that I should be opposed to the judgment of friends with whom, on so many subjects, I cordially unite; but you will give me credit for not having lightly come to the conclusion, that the stand taken by the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Committee is based upon the immutable principles of truth, and that, in acting upon them, they are entitled to hope for the Divine blessing.

At the time this question was exciting much political interest in England, I was in the United States, and had an opportunity of calmly and deliberately reconsidering the opinion I had previously formed, uninfluenced by local circumstances; and the result was a firm conviction that the course you now recommend was calculated to rivet the chains of the unhappy victims of slavery for ages yet to come. I should be shrinking from what I consider an imperative duty, if I did not, at the present crisis, urge in the strongest terms the friends of the slave to unite for the removal of the restrictions upon the introduction of tropical productions, from every part of the world, which are not stained by the blood, or extorted from the uncompensated toil, of our fellow-creatures, instead of encouraging a policy which must have the effect of weakening the barriers which check the extension of the pollutions of this atrocious system in our own country. If Government would thus apply the power of England on the side of freedom, it would do more to terminate slavery and the slave-trade throughout the world, and to raise the moral standard of Britain on this subject, than any measure yet adopted by the legislature.

I am, very sincerely and respectfully, your friend,
JOSEPH STURGE.

Mr. Sturge has favoured us with copies of some of the many letters which he has received, and we here insert them for the information of our readers.

3rd month 26th, 1844.

ESTREMED FRIEND, JOSEPH STURGE,—I have received from thee a printed paper addressed to our respected late anti-slavery friends, Thomas Spencer, William T. Blair, and G. W. Anstie. I thank thee for it. I think I can concur in every position therein advanced against opening the British markets to slave-grown sugar.

The longer I consider this subject, the more I am satisfied with the course that the Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society has taken. I see not only that the Committee is right, but where the free traders are wrong in reference to this question. They are untrue to their own principles; they do not carry them out. They call for free trade for the rich man, and not for the poor. They are loud for the wealthy ship-owners, the manufacturers, merchants, proprietors to have free markets; they are dumb respecting the poor man, whose only merchandize is his labour, the power of his muscles, his capacity to cultivate the cane. This is as much his article of commerce as the sugar and coffee are of the proprietors and capitalists, and ought to be (if they are consistent with themselves) equally regarded by the free traders. A true free trader must make the abolition of slavery the groundwork of the system. It is labour only, that most despised of all things, which gives value to all the rest, to every thing else; and not to insist upon a free market for labour, the liberty of its possessors to carry it and to offer it to whatever person he chooses as a purchaser, is to violate the very first principle of trade and commerce, and to render all that is erected upon it baseless. The free traders assert the free trade of the labourer in corn, but not in sugar. They weigh corn with the long arm, and sugar with the short arm of the steel-yard. They are the truly inconsistent. They have given up, yes, given up, the vantage-ground of truth to the Tories, and yet say they stand upon it themselves. While they profess to be abolitionists, they advocate the direct interests of slaveholders upon the very principle which alone induces them to become and continue slaveholders, namely, the permanent advantage of trading unrestricted by the limitations of Christian morals. In this thing the free trade advocates are the hypocrites, and not the Tories. I wish some WOMAN would shame them by writing a

book, like Elizabeth Heyrick's "Immediate, not gradual emancipation"—"Complete, not partial free trade."

It is painful to see the defection of the individuals whom thou hast addressed, who have rendered such valuable service to the cause of emancipation; yet it is a satisfaction to know that many have not been drawn away from their abolition principles, either by political party or political economy, and I am inclined to think that the Committee will rise morally into higher respect for the stand it now makes on this subject.

I am, &c.,

* * * *

To Joseph Sturge.

The Vicarage, Selshead, Devizes, March 26, 1844.

MY DEAR SIR,—I have read with great attention the address signed by Messrs. Blair, Spencer, and my friend Anstie (with the latter of whom I have had some conversation), and I am anxious to inform you that I fully agree with the printed letter forwarded to me bearing your signature. I should be exceedingly sorry to see the friends of negro freedom stultify themselves, by consenting to a measure which would increase the slave trade and the miseries of the slave to an incalculable extent; and not only on that account, but because I believe that there would be great wickedness in sanctioning a principle which would go far to render nugatory, as an *example to the world*, our late act of emancipation. Was it for this that a Clarkson and a Wilberforce, and a host of abolitionists, spent their strength? Surely not; they had no intention of thus pulling down with one hand what they built up with the other. I am no political man; I interfere not with mere political questions; but here is one of humanity and Christian principle. Let the Government, if it think proper, cheapen our sugars by a total or partial remission of duty, and the sooner the better; but I trust the people of England have virtue enough to pay even a *higher price*, rather than the *blood of the slave should be mingled with it*; otherwise, we have our work to do over again. Pray make any use of my name in this matter as you may think proper, and believe me to remain an enemy to the introduction of slave-grown produce, and,

My dear Sir, yours sincerely,

J. H. JOHNSON.

Joseph Sturge, Esq.

TO THOMAS SPENCER, T. W. BLAIR, AND G. W. ANSTIE.

Newcastle-on Tyne, 3rd mo. 23, 1844.

RESPECTED FRIENDS,—I have duly received your circular, with remarks upon the conduct of the Anti-slavery Committee; and, as you request a reply, I will offer to your consideration a few observations.

Having been deeply concerned for the success of the anti-slavery struggle for the long period of fifty years, and having been a diligent reader of the *Anti-slavery Reporter*, of the editors of which publication I once heard William Knibb publicly assert that "they never err," and having also carefully read the late James Cropper's controversy with John Gladstone, with many other publications and speeches in parliament, &c., bearing on the principles of the great question so long at issue, I must candidly profess to you, that, in my judgment, if the Committee of the Anti-slavery Society had not remonstrated against any measure having for its avowed object the introduction of the sugars of Brazil, Cuba, &c., (being slave-grown produce,) for consumption in this kingdom, they would have neglected their duty in reference to the African slave-trade.

I cannot believe that many, if any, of the older abolitionists would have advocated such a measure, not even James Cropper, with all his large and comprehensive views of the benefits of free trade generally. He was, in my apprehension, a sound abolitionist, both of the slave-trade and slavery.

Had the Committee of the Anti-slavery Society pursued the opposite course, it would have been a suicidal act of policy, at variance with all their previous proceedings, and would, indeed, have gone far to lay waste their future efforts.

Believing that the use of tea, coffee, and sugar, not only contribute largely to the comfort of the poor in this country, but also that they have tended almost to eradicate some diseases which were very prevalent half a century ago—particularly the scurvy—(yet I do not wholly attribute the change to this cause, but partly also to the diminished use of salt provisions in winter, now rendered unnecessary by the large cultivation of turnips for the winter fodder of cattle)—and believing also that a very extended use of the above articles in lieu of intoxicating liquors would have a further beneficial effect, I cannot but advocate such a line of sound policy on the part of Government as would tend to reduce the price. But this should be done by encouraging the cultivation in both the West and East Indies, and by a further reduction of duty, both on tea and sugar. Nor would I object were the duties equalised, as to all sugar or coffee the *produce of free labour*. Nor would such a measure be likely materially to affect the amount of the revenue derived from these articles, were the duty on tea only 1s. per lb., and that on sugar 10s. per cwt. When the duty on coffee was reduced from 2s. 6d. to 8d. per lb., the effect in increasing the consumption was astonishing. I have no doubt but that, in twelve months after the change took place, it was nearly tenfold. This would be the more likely to be again the case, if the duty on both tea and sugar were to be reduced at the same time.

But let us no longer serve our own country, whether the rich or the poor, at the cost of hogsheads of African blood. After the sacrifices which the country has already made for the extinction of the slave trade and slavery, and after the exposition of the dreadful sufferings on board the slave ships, surely to promote an increase of this trade would be a sin of a deep die.

You must bear with me if I say that the reasoning in your circular appears to me very unsound in various respects. England does indeed admit slave-grown produce in the articles of cotton, indigo, rice, and tobacco, with some other articles of home consumption; but, if we are doing wrong in a few cases, let us not add to our crimes. But would it not be wise and consistent policy so to order the fiscal regulations, as that in all these cases free labour produce should at least have a decided preference?

The capabilities of the West India islands, especially the island of Jamaica, have never yet been fairly and fully developed. On the abolition, the females, I apprehend, very generally withdrew from sugar cultivation. Many of the men also were soon driven into free villages by the oppressive measures of the planters. But let a little time elapse, and there will be a rapid and accumulating increase of population; this, with the introduction of machinery, when brought to bear upon sugar cultivation, will be likely vastly to increase their exports of sugar and coffee.

Then again, the resources of the East Indies, were a just and liberal line of policy to be adopted toward the natives, with the introduction of mechanical and other improvements in the management of sugar cultivation, would immensely increase the quantity fit to be brought to England. I have known the lowest price of raw sugar retailed in this town to be 1s. 3d. per lb., but very probably, in a few years, it may not exceed 4d. per lb.

It appears to me that you unfairly ascribe the objection to the introduction of slave-grown produce to a conscientious objection to the use of such produce abstractedly considered. This I apprehend to be the case with very few. Our objection is grounded on a strong fear, that, to encourage the peculiarly iniquitous proceedings of the Brazils and of Cuba, as connected with the continuance of the African slave trade, would be to undo the labour of many years, by directly adding to their inducements to persevere in carrying on this horrible traffic.

Neither is it fair to speak of the Anti-slavery Committee as departing from their pacific professions. They have not called on the legislature to impose a high prohibitory duty which had not previously existed; but, even had they done this, to speak of it as an appeal to armed force, is quite an overstrained argument. But if I understand the case aright, all the Committee did was to express their dissent from any relaxation of the duty already existing upon slave-grown produce, which, in my view, was their imperative duty, in accordance with the course they had been pursuing, and the views they had uniformly avowed, for a long series of years.

I would not call upon Government to impose any tax; but of those which are imposed, we have a fair right to point out to them that some taxes are much more inconvenient, oppressive, or objectionable, than others.

I am aware that the sugars of the Brazils and Cuba are now being brought to England, and refined for export; but why is it so, but to gratify the unprincipled avarice of some of our merchants?

With a proper estimate of your past labours in the abolition cause, and with the hope that you may be favoured to see the dangerous tendency of your present course,

I remain, your friend,

GEORGE RICHARDSON.

London, 27th March, 1844.

MY DEAR FRIEND,—I entirely agree with you on the sugar question, not as viewing it as a subject of political economy, but under the circumstances of the case taken altogether. When the British nation gave 20,000,000*l.* to the persons called owners of slaves, they did so for the sake of humanity, but in direct violation of all rules of political economy; and it would be, in my mind, the most absurd of all absurd things to give 20,000,000*l.* sterling to get rid in our own colonies of all the cruelties necessarily incident to slavery, and then immediately after to open our markets to slave-grown sugar in other countries, and thus to hold out a bonus to those countries to continue and increase all the horrors of negro slavery. It is, to my mind, a one-sided, left-handed humanity, to free the negro in our own colonies, and then to augment his suffering in other countries. It is said, "Will you be so cruel to the people of England as to refuse them cheap sugar?" I say, Yes, I will; if the cheapness of that sugar is to be secured by shedding the blood of the negro. I would not consent to give the people of England, or of Ireland either, cheap sugar at the expense of robbery or stealing. I will not consent to give it to them by the murder of the negro. If the throat of the negro was to be cut at once in the process of augmenting the produce of sugar canes, every body would call that murder. And it is no less murder to cut his back with the lash, and work him to a premature death, which are the necessary consequences of the production of sugar by negro slave labour.

As you see how entirely I agree with you on this subject, command my services at any time, and in any place you please.

It is no answer to say, "That we use slave-grown tobacco, and slave-grown cotton." My reply is—that I would prevent both if I possibly could; and it is no reason at all, that, because I cannot prevent two existing crimes, therefore I should consent to the commission of a third crime. Every law, human and Divine, prohibits such conduct. I will prevent as much criminality as I can, and endeavour as much as possible to lessen that which I cannot prevent; leaving it in the hands of Providence to dispose the hearts of other men so as not anywhere to augment human misery.

Believe me to be very faithfully yours,

(Signed) DANIEL O'CONNELL.

Joseph Sturge, Esq.

In addition to these documents, the Committee have been obliged by Mr. Peek with a copy of the reply which he has forwarded to the Circular. We insert it below:—

Hazelwood, near Kingsbridge, 21st March, 1844.

DEAR SIR,—In reply to your note, I most decidedly object to my name being affixed to the address, which appears to me one of the most insidious pro-slavery addresses I ever saw.

For more than twenty years in London, I was engaged in buying and selling by wholesale sugar, coffee, cocoa, and other articles the produce of slave and free labour; and it is my deliberate judgment that nothing would give a greater stimulus to slavery and the slave-trade, than to admit the produce of slaves on the same terms as free labour.

If I wished to extend slavery, to increase the slave-trade with all its horrors, and to perpetuate both, I would adopt your address as the best means of accomplishing these objects.

I am not now a member of the Anti-Slavery Committee. I am therefore at liberty to say that you have grossly misrepresented them (I hope not intentionally).

I was present at the formation of the Society, and I am intimately acquainted with all its proceedings; and I know, therefore, that to say the Committee demand the employment of an armed force, and to insinuate that they approve of the ships of war on the coast of Africa, is directly contrary to fact.

I can see a wide difference between fiscal regulations and physical force, nor do I consider that our duties are collected at the point of the bayonet.

I care not whether the planters in the east or west would be injured or benefited by admitting slave-grown produce. The only question for every anti-slavery man is, Would it increase or decrease slavery and the slave-trade? It is a secondary consideration whether sugar would be 1d. per pound cheaper, or not. I have a much better opinion of the "millions" than to suppose they would wish to increase and perpetuate slavery, even if they could get sugar 2d. per pound cheaper.

I am an advocate for free trade, but I do not mean that every thief in this country should be at liberty to sell the produce of his unlawful occupations in the best market. My notions of free trade extend only to property lawfully obtained.

I contend that slaves are stolen, and that every slaveholder is a thief, or the receiver or holder of stolen property, and that he ought to have the same liberty of free trade as thieves have in this country, and nothing better.

I should like the government to enact a law to encourage free trade with all the world in articles the produce of free labour, and in the same enactment to prohibit the produce of slaves of every country from touching our shores; and this might be accomplished by the ordinary power of law, and the ordinary means every civilized country adopts to carry out their fiscal regulations.

I admit your description of the Brazilian empire is correct, but I do not agree with you as to the best means of inducing them to abandon slavery; there is something so hardening and demoralizing in the system, that there is only one avenue open, that is, self-interest.

We should offer to receive their produce on the most advantageous terms whenever they abolish slavery; but they, and all other nations, should be self-excluded, so long as they continue that system.

I believe free-labour could compete with slavery, if in precisely the same circumstances; but the exhausted estates in the West Indies cannot compete with slavery in Brazil and Cuba, because their soil is much better. But, as I said before, I care nothing for the West Indies; but I cannot approve of what I conscientiously think will very much increase slavery, and, as a consequence, the slave-trade.

Would it not be better to confine your notions of free trade to property honestly obtained?

I am exceedingly grieved to see gentlemen I esteem advocating the extension of slavery, which I know they detest.

Praying that you may be enabled to see the consequences of your plan, I remain, yours sincerely, R. PEEK.

To the Rev. Thos. Spencer.

We conclude this series with the following resolution of the Newcastle Auxiliary, which has been obligingly transmitted to the office:—

At a meeting of the Committee of the Anti-slavery Society of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, held this 27th day of March, 1844, Mr. Finlay in the chair,

Resolved.—That this Committee, having had laid before them an "Address to the Friends of the Negro," &c., forwarded by the Rev. T. Spencer, and W. T. Blair and G. W. Anstie, Esqrs., on the subject of the introduction of slave-grown produce into this country, are unanimously of opinion that the conduct of the Committee of the Anti-slavery Society in London with respect to this question is founded upon the principles of righteousness and sound policy, and in harmony with the original constitution of the Anti-slavery Society. And that this meeting expresses its perfect confidence in the parent Committee, and its hope that they will persevere in the same path of religion, justice, and humanity, which has hitherto marked their steps.

And that copies of this Resolution be forwarded to Messrs. Spencer, Blair, and Anstie, and to the Committee of the Anti-slavery Society in London, and also to Joseph Sturge, Esq.

By the direction of the Committee,

JAMES FINLAY, Chairman.

SLAVERY IN AMERICA.

On the 1st of April was published, in THE BRITISH CHURCHMAN, the first of a Series of Letters on

THE CONNEXION OF THE AMERICAN CHURCH WITH SLAVERY. By an AMERICAN CHURCHMAN.

Groombridge, 5, Paternoster-row, London; Parker, Oxford; Stevenson, Cambridge; Gallie and Bayley, Edinburgh; Curry, Dublin; Wiley and Putnam, New York.

* * Orders for the "British Churchman" received by every bookseller in the kingdom.

Recently published, price One Shilling,

THE TRIAL of PEDRO DE ZULUETA, Jun., at the Central Criminal Court of the City of London, on the 27th, 28th, and 30th days of October, 1843, on a charge of Slave-trading. Reported by J. F. JOHNSON, Short-hand Writer. With introductory and concluding remarks, by the Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society. (Second Edition.)

To the Trial, as reported in this pamphlet, is annexed a very interesting and important Appendix, containing extracts from the log of the *Augusta*, and the slave-trading instructions put on board at Cadiz.

"We strongly recommend all who feel any interest in the abolition of this accursed traffic to procure and peruse this trial."—*Patriot*.

London: Thomas Ward and Co., 27, Paternoster-row; and Office of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, 27, New Broad-street.

Now ready, price One Shilling and Sixpence to Non-Subscribers, THE FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT of the BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY; with a copious Appendix, in reference to the Slave-trade throughout the world; its extent; the cost of endeavours to suppress it; abolition of Slavery in British India, the British settlements in the East, Scinde, &c.; results of Emancipation in the West India colonies; Emigration from Africa to the West Indies; Emigration of Indian Labourers to Mauritius; British subjects holding Slaves in foreign countries; Washington Treaty; Slavery in the United States of America, the Dutch, French, Spanish and Portuguese colonies, and in Brazil; Treaties with the South American republics and with Hayti; Slavery in the East, &c. &c.

London: Thomas Ward and Co., 27, Paternoster-row; and British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, 27, New Broad-street.

ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION, 1843.

Just Published, under the sanction of the Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, in one handsome vol., price 7s. 6d. cloth,

A FULL REPORT of the PROCEEDINGS of the RECENT ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION. By J. F. JOHNSON, Short-hand Writer.

Statesmen, philanthropists, and merchants will find in this volume copious information upon every point connected with slavery and the slave-trade in America, Brazil, Cuba, Texas, &c., &c.

"It is wholly the affair of Mr. Johnson, the short-hand writer; a very spirited affair, for which both the Committee and the public are much indebted to him."—*Anti-Slavery Reporter*.

"In this volume will be found a greater amount of information on the general question of slavery than was ever, we believe, before submitted to the world."—*Morning Advertiser*.

"The volume is a noble monument of an event which reflects the brightest honour, not only on our country, but on our common Christianity. Great, indeed, had been the loss to humanity, if this record had not been preserved. As the friends of the oppressed of every colour, in every clime, and as the inexorable, the immortal adversaries of slavery all over the world, we recommend, we urge the diffusion of this book among all classes of the community. We do trust that the reception of this momentous publication will be such as to speak fresh hope for the cause of the slave, and to proclaim that there is no decay in the philanthropy of England."—*Christian Witness*.

John Snow, 35, Paternoster-row; and the Office of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, 27, New Broad-street.

NOTICES.

THE ANTI-SLAVERY REPORTER is an Evening Paper, published on alternate Wednesdays, and may be had of all News-vendors throughout the country. Price 4d., or 8s. 8d. per annum. A few complete volumes are on hand.

Subscriptions and Donations to the Society should be forwarded to the Treasurer, (G. W. Alexander, Esq.), at the Society's Office, 27, New Broad-street, London.

All Communications for the Editor of the *Anti-Slavery Reporter* must be sent to the Office of the Society, as above.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Several articles which we had prepared for this number have been crowded out by the very important documents on the Sugar Question.

The demand for our last number has been so great, that we shall be obliged if any persons not wishing to keep their papers will kindly return them to the office.

The Anti-Slavery Reporter.

LONDON, APRIL 3, 1844.

THE documents on the Sugar question to which we have thought it our duty to assign so large a part of our space to-day, will occasion no surprise to those who have been acquainted with the progress of anti-slavery affairs in Great Britain during the last two or three years. What has long been discussed in private, and what was, indeed, strenuously debated in the Anti-Slavery Convention of last year, has now become matter of public appeal and controversy. It is useless to say, either, that we dislike controversy in general, or that we regret this controversy in particular. It is the method in which the mind of man works; and it is better that the workings of the human mind should have free scope, than that they should be in any way repressed. It remains only for those concerned to

act their part in it with some vigorous use of their understandings, and a careful guard upon their temper.

For ourselves, we lay no claim to the character or influence of an oracle. We are Anti-slavery *Reporters*. And, accordingly, we have contented ourselves with presenting to our readers the documents as yet pertaining to the case, and nothing more; although we shall not, of course, be precluded from showing our opinion hereafter. Our only counsel at the present moment is, that parties will not act in haste. The subject brought before them is not only very interesting and important, but very extensive and complicated. Let a full and careful consideration be given to it; and may truth and wisdom guide our way!

Proceeds have multiplied since our last, that the case of John L. Brown, under sentence of death in South Carolina for aiding a slave to escape, has created throughout Great Britain a sensation of the deepest and most painful kind. On the 14th of March a crowded public meeting of the Glasgow Emancipation Society was held in that city. Alexander Hastie, Esq., a magistrate, (in the absence of the Lord Provost) in the chair, at which the following resolutions on this afflictive subject were enthusiastically passed:—

"Resolved,—1st. That the punishment of a human being by death for any offence, is at all times most revolting; that, while there are many, and they seem to be rapidly increasing, who deny the right to take away life by judicial sentence for any crime, there are others who deem it to be at least a questionable measure; but it is the opinion of this meeting that there will be few, if any, found, even under the most despotic governments, who will attempt to justify the punishing with death of John L. Brown, who, it appears, was convicted lately at Winnsborough, South Carolina, in the United States of America, of 'aiding a female slave to run away and depart from her master's service,' and who is sentenced by J. B. O'Neal, the Judge of the district, to be executed on the 26th day of April next.

"2nd. That the murderous proceedings of Lynch law, which so frequently occur in the southern or slave states of America, are not more disgusting and offensive than is the professional coldness and would-be religious formality with which this Judge pretends, as God's vicegerent, to take away this man's life for what he deems to be an 'offence,' and for what, doubtless, is an offence against the laws of slavery; but for that which, wherever God's laws are regarded, would be esteemed a meritorious act.

"3rd. That this meeting would calmly remonstrate with the judicial authorities of the state of South Carolina, on the gross cruelty and injustice of this sentence, as being at variance with the eternal law of God, 'Thou shalt do no murder,' or 'Thou shalt not kill;' and 'whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them,' would earnestly entreat them, for their own sakes, to pause awhile, and consider lest, in executing this sentence, they bring the greater condemnation upon themselves, and repent when too late; and would remind them that there is also a law which says, 'Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant who is escaped from his master unto thee: he shall dwell with thee, even among you, in that place which he shall choose in one of thy gates, where it liketh him best; thou shalt not oppress him,' Deut. xxiii. 15, 16."

At Edinburgh, the Magistrates and Town Council convened a public meeting, which was held in the Music Hall, on the 2nd of March, John Urquhart, Esq., acting chief magistrate, (in the absence of the Lord Provost) being called to the chair. This meeting was large in number, and of great respectability, being attended by almost all the members of the Town Council, a number of ministers of all denominations, and many gentlemen of the highest standing in the community; and at it the following resolutions were unanimously passed:—

"1. That, this meeting having learned that a man named John L. Brown has, for aiding the escape of a female slave from her master's service, been condemned to death at Winnsborough, South Carolina, by the Hon. J. B. O'Neal, Judge of the District, we do hereby declare our utter horror of this sentence, as one which, however sanctioned by the penal code of any state, is intrinsically unjust and cruel.

"2. That we regard this sentence as a natural though dreadful fruit of the unrighteous system of slavery, and as a further evidence, were any now required, that that system, in itself an enormous violation of human rights and human duties, cannot by any nation be maintained as a branch of its polity, without debasing its standard of morality and corrupting the fountains of public justice.

"3. That, not seeking to palliate, but, on the contrary, humbly acknowledging the deep guilt which this Christian country incurred by the long maintenance of its colonial slavery, we nevertheless feel bound to declare that we view slavery, in any form, as peculiarly criminal and odious in a nation such as the United States, which enjoying, not less than others, the lights of Christian knowledge and civilization, has, beyond all others, professed an ardent love of freedom, and laid the foundation of its independence in that memorable Declaration, 'that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; and that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.'

"4. That, disclaiming all presumptuous intermeddling with the affairs of a distant though kindred nation, we are yet constrained to urge upon the American authorities our solemn remonstrance against the execution of this their sentence, consigning a prisoner to the extreme penalty of death for an act which, though it may be branded as a crime by an arbitrary law of man, appears, when tested by the law of God, not merely no moral offence, but the discharge of a positive duty of charity to a distressed fellow-creature.

"5. That the acting chief magistrate, chairman of this meeting, be requested to sign and ratify with the seal of the city the above resolutions, as passed by act of the inhabitants in public meeting assembled; and that copies hereof be transmitted to the American President, and to

the proper authorities of South Carolina, through the United States' Ambassador in London and the British Consul at Charleston."

Besides this, we observe that an address "to the Churches of Christ in South Carolina" has been signed extensively on behalf of the Independent churches of Lancashire, and that the example thus set has been followed enthusiastically throughout the country. These external movements, however, are but slender indications of the universal and sickening horror which every remembrance of this judicial outrage inspires, not only in Great Britain, but wherever throughout Europe it has become known. They are but straws on the surface of that deep stream of emotion against which no people desirous of the esteem of mankind can venture to contend. Mr. Elizur Wright, an American gentleman now in this country, and among the staunchest of her band of abolitionists, in endeavouring to account for the coolness with which this atrocity is regarded in the United States, passes upon the slaveholding portion of that confederacy the severest and most biting censure we remember to have heard. "I take it as a mark of progress towards humanity," says he, "that the murder of Brown is put under the form of law." Well may he add, "I blush to write such a confession."

THE advices from Cuba which appear in the public papers, although scanty and unsatisfactory as to detail, are of the highest interest to the cause of humanity. It is beyond question that an alarming unquietness prevails extensively among the slaves, and that a growing reluctance exists to any augmentation of their number. Memorials against the continuance of the slave-trade have poured in upon the new Governor in such numbers, and from such influential quarters, that he has at length consented to transmit them to Madrid. What is yet more promising is, that, of a cargo of 1,200 slaves just arrived from Africa, no purchaser could be found for even a single individual. If the planters thus take the matter into their own hands, the question of the slave-trade will soon be settled.

SUGAR QUESTION—THE GLASGOW MEMORIAL.

To the Right Honourable the EARL OF ABERDEEN, her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Foreign Department, and to the other Members of her Majesty's Government.

The committee of the Glasgow Emancipation Society, perceiving that the various topics connected with sugar—the introduction or exclusion of foreign or of slave-grown sugar on differential or equal duties, the policy of these measures, and the effect they may have upon slavery or the slave-trade—at present very much occupy the attention of the parties interested, of the Legislature, and of the Government, and also, it may be presumed, of the foreign states affected by these measures; and, encouraged by the favourable reception of their former memorial, and the hope that the measure to which they now beg leave to direct your lordship's attention may be found adapted to the present juncture, humbly present to your lordship the following memorial:—

Showing.—That, whereas the British Government and people have, for many years, by a course of policy too unequivocal to be misunderstood or questioned, exhibited a strong aversion to slavery and the slave-trade, and a manifest desire, at the expense of costly sacrifices, not only to abolish them herself, but to use every practicable means to prevail upon other powers to abolish them;—

And whereas she has most distinctly evinced her sincerity by having ceased from these iniquities, which are still practised by other states with whom she has commercial intercourse, and which are the source of great evils even now inflicted upon mankind, but especially upon the natives of Africa;—

And whereas it is held, by a very large and influential portion of the British people, that, to cultivate with foreign states a friendly intercourse, by a commercial interchange of produce and manufactures upon the most liberal and equal terms, is a policy beneficial to ourselves and to those states (and in this policy your memorialists acquiesce, provided they are not thereby made instrumental in extending the evils of slavery and the slave-trade, the abolition of which this nation is pledged to promote by every practicable means);—

And, believing that her Majesty's Government participates in these feelings, and that we have discovered a principle by which that intercourse may be cultivated with those foreign powers who desire it, not only on safe moral grounds, but so that, in proportion as it is cultivated and extended even with the Brazils and Cuba, and in proportion as we import their produce on this principle, so will slavery be diminished and gradually abolished, and, consequently, the slave-trade;—

Your memorialists would, therefore, humbly, but strongly and earnestly, recommend to your lordships to examine and adopt this principle, and to urge it upon these foreign powers, unless it is found to be objectionable.

It is simply that those Brazilian or Cuban planters, whether they amount to 5, 20, 50, 100, or more, who are desirous that their sugars, &c., shall be admitted into the British market on the same terms as British free-labour sugar, will notify to the British Government that such is their wish, and also the names of their plantations, their extent, with the number and description of the slaves on each, and their sugars will be admitted forthwith, provided they agree to cultivate their plantations and raise their sugars by free labour; that is, by wages, and not by the whip, or any other coercive system. And, in order that satisfactory proof may be obtained that their sugars, &c., are raised by free labour, as the British sugars are, there shall be British officials appointed, and permitted to reside on each plantation as inspectors, to see that these plantations are so cultivated. And it shall be the duty of these inspectors so to brand the sugar casks or packages, and otherwise so to certify that these sugars, the produce of these plantations, were cultivated by free labour; that is, that the labourers were paid wages for their cultivation, and were not coerced by the whip or any other method.

Thus, by offering these terms, a test is also established, by which it may be discovered whether the Brazilian and Cuban planters are or are not firmly attached to slavery; and, of course, whether or not they are persons in whose favour the British people would be justified to relax their principles so as to admit their slave-grown produce, as is proposed by a certain party, in the hope that they may afterwards abandon slavery and the slave-trade.

Were five, ten, or twenty planters, in a circuit of fifty, a hundred, or two hundred miles, to agree to these terms, the system of free labour will soon extend (for, from its own nature, it cannot safely retrograde), until, in a very short time, it will include all within reach of the infection; and, the privileged terms operating as a bonus, slavery will be quietly and almost imperceptibly abolished, and, consequently, the slave-trade. The sugars of Brazil and Cuba may thus be gradually introduced into the British market on the same terms as British sugars, until, by adopting the wages system, the planters of these countries become entitled to this privilege, and slavery and the slave-trade thereby become extinct. At the same time, the British people will be enjoying cheaper sugar, in a ratio increasing according to the quantity thus admitted, as free labour increases until all is admitted, and at the trifling expense to the British of keeping inspectors in these places for a few years, on the plantations where the terms are agreed to and complied with.

It may also be expected, that, in proportion as this system of free labour extends, so will the demand for slaves be diminished, and the amount expended on armed preventive squadrons, &c., &c., be proportionably lessened.

There seems no reason to doubt that, if, from the insecurity of life and property connected with the slave system, or from any other cause, only a few were tempted to try this scheme, the number would rapidly increase; and, if only in a few years they came to amount to one-third, or even one-fourth of the planters, the rest would have to fall into it almost at once, for the slaves still retained in slavery will naturally be clamorous to be put on the same footing with those receiving wages. The same system may also be proposed to the cotton-planters of America.

This measure, it appears to us, may be submitted to the respective governments, or to the planters in each place without any reference to their governments, or to planters and governments simultaneously, as to your lordships may appear proper.

Signed by order, and on behalf of the committee of the Glasgow Emancipation Society,

JOHN MURRAY, }
WILLIAM SMEAL, } Secretaries.

Glasgow, 25th March, 1844.

Correspondence.

MR. BRIGHT'S SPEECH.
To the Editor of the Anti-Slavery Reporter.

Hitchin, March 29, 1844.

SIR.—Your last Number contains a report of the speech of John Bright, Esq., M.P., in the House of Commons, on the importation of sugar from Brazil, in which he is reported as having said that several Anti-Slavery Associations had seceded from the London Society, and among others mentioned was the Hitchin Auxiliary. I have written to Mr. Bright, by direction of our Committee, to say that, although nearly three years since we differed on one point from the London Committee, we did not secede, nor was secession ever contemplated; but that, on the contrary, our correspondence and co-operation had been uninterrupted, and our confidence unabated.

Will you have the kindness to state this fact in any way you think best in your next Number?

I am, very respectfully yours,
JOHN W. WAYNE, Sec.

AMERICAN SLAVERY—JOHN L. BROWN.

To the Editor of the Anti-Slavery Reporter.

50, Marchmont-street, March 23, 1844.

SIR.—Permit me, as an American, to thank you, and the abolitionists of Great Britain, for the sympathy which has been manifested towards John L. Brown, convicted by a jury of my countrymen of an act of humanity, and therefore sentenced by a republican judge, to suffer an ignominious death! I am asked why so little feeling is expressed in the United States. Suffer me to explain the matter as it appears to me.

In regard to the abolitionists of my country, it is not because deep and indignant feeling does not exist. Thousands of hearts have been made to bleed afresh, and to deepen their vows against the monstrous iniquity. Utterance had been given to this feeling before I left the United States, in many of our smaller meetings, as well as through the press; but it had not been made the basis of a general public agitation, partly from fear of insuring the death of the victim, and partly because the public mind of even the free States, as your beloved and venerable Clarkson too truly describes it, has become demoralised—callous and apathetic towards such awful outrages upon justice. I blush to write such a confession, but I take it as a mark of progress towards humanity that the murder of Brown is put under the form of law. A few years ago, the case would have been disposed of as were those of M'Intosh, in St. Louis, and Albe Dean, in Mississippi. The latter was an estimable citizen of Connecticut, and was tried by men similar to Judge O'Neal sitting in "Lynch" Court, and hung on the next tree, on the bare suspicion of being guilty of humanity. My pen trembles when I write, that Connecticut, my native state, never to my knowledge lisped a request for reparation in regard to that flagrant violation of justice, and of our federal constitution! Our little band of despised abolitionists, however, were not silent; and rely upon it, that at least 50,000 voices will now use the monstrous charge and diabolical sentence of Judge O'Neal to illustrate the principle which we have resolved to live and die by, viz., that self-evident injustice cannot be law.

As to Brown, I cannot but hope, from their adopting the forms of law and deferring the execution, that it is in the breast of the civil authorities to let him escape, after having humiliated him to their satisfaction. The judges of the south are miserable slaves to slavery, and Judge O'Neal probably regards his part in the horrible mockery, his daring to take jurisdiction in a case which custom has assigned to a more summary tribunal, as an heroic achievement in favour of humanity.

The reason why we have not attempted a public show of indignation and rebuke, I may therefore state to be, our apprehension that such action might lessen the victim's chance of escape. In other cases, where the same principle is involved without a similar danger, the American abolitionists have not been backward. Witness the case of Latimer, last year, in Massachusetts. As the result of that agitation, that commonwealth has forbidden any of her magistrates to take cognizance of the cases of fugitive slaves, or to suffer any of her gaols to be employed in detaining their persons. I may safely say no such fugitive can hereafter be recovered from her territory. Her citizens generally are too much aroused to the meanness and wickedness of permitting such piracy, to allow the unconstitutional act of Congress, for that purpose made and provided, to take effect on their soil. Large contributions have been made in the free states, for the purpose of appealing to the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Mr. Van Zandt, heavily fined in an inferior court for rendering assistance to a fugitive. If the appeal is unsuccessful, I trust American abolitionists will not leave Mr. Van Zandt to suffer. They have resolved themselves into a Mutual Assurance Society against all such fines.

A word more on another topic. I am glad to see so high an authority as Thomas Clarkson impute that blot on America—repudiation, to its true cause, slavery: let me bear my testimony to the truth of it. As to the slaveholders, they are repudiators by birth. The prince of them, Henry Clay, long time a candidate for the presidency, has not probably paid his first sixpence to his washerwoman. One of his arguments against the exclusion of slavery from Missouri was, that it would reduce him to the alternative of blacking his own boots, or paying for it! What has Threadneedle-street to expect of such men? As to the northern repudiators, they are men who have lost, probably their money, certainly their morals, in the Maelstrom of slaveholding prodigality and profligacy. But do not involve us all in the condemnation. There is a party, headed by a repentant and reformed slaveholder, geometrically progressing towards victory; and I will answer for it, soon after it reaches the goal, the last farthing of the repudiated debts will be paid with interest.

I am sorry for one expression, which occurred in the postscript of the excellent letter of Mr. Clarkson, published in the last number of the *Anti-Slavery Reporter*, and I can hardly believe that he wrote it with consideration. He says, "Not that I condemn the judge for condemning Brown, because, as a judge, he must uphold the law while it exists," &c. Now, on just that point the abolitionists of America are at issue with their opponents. They do condemn the judge: they hold that he could not regard as law, a statute which flatly contradicts the higher law of Almighty God. In their last national convention at Buffalo, in an assembly of 5,000 persons, they solemnly took this ground in relation to the constitution of the United States, holding that the clause requiring the surrender of fugitive slaves, even if it were expressed, as it is not, in unequivocal language, would be null and void from its own inherent, self-evident iniquity. They support their position by a reference to the foundation principles of human laws, as laid down by Blackstone and reaffirmed by our own judges, as well as to the Divine law. Our opponents to the two pro-slavery parties, in copying our manifesto, took care to omit our legal authority, and then argued from our sole reliance on Divine authority, that we were endeavouring to bring about a union of church and state; but, if our doctrine is not true, then law is merely formalized mobocracy, or regulated tyranny, and so the good people of the free states begin to regard the matter. None of our opponents can now look us in the face, and plead for one moment's observance by judge, jury, or citizen, of a law for the commission of the foulest crime. Call it revolution, if you please; it is the revolution of immediate repentance, which cannot be unpleasing to God, or dangerous to our civil institutions.

I do hope that our American expounders of law and gospel, who would justify our judges for robbing and murdering by statute, may not be allowed to quote the venerated Clarkson against us.

Yours, for justice and not injustice under law,
ELIZUR WRIGHT, Jun.

Parliamentary Intelligence.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.—Thursday, March 21, 1844.

WEST INDIA IMMIGRATION.

Mr. VERNON SMITH, understanding from the papers laid upon the table of the House, that inquiries had been instituted by the noble lord the Secretary for the Colonies, addressed to the governors of Trinidad, Jamaica, and Guiana, as to whether it would be advisable to relax the rule which prevailed of requiring a proportion of women, amounting to one-third, in any immigration which might take place into those colonies; and also understanding that answers had been received favourable to such relaxation from the governors of the colonies, wished to know whether the noble lord had acted upon the information thus obtained?

Lord STANLEY replied, that, in consequence of communications which had been made from Sierra Leone, stating that great difficulty had been found, in consequence of the restriction alluded to, in prevailing upon men who were desirous of immigrating to West India colonies to do so, he had written to the governors of Jamaica, Trinidad, and Guiana, to inquire whether, in their opinion, a relaxation of the rule as to the proportion of the men to be admitted would be advisable. Their answers had only been received four or five days ago; and, although the papers containing them had been immediately laid before the House, no actual steps had yet been taken in consequence of the information communicated in them.

Foreign Intelligence.

CUBA.—THE SLAVE REVOLTS.—We have already stated, that the apprehensions excited by the late revolts induced the planters in the neighbourhood of Matanzas to petition the Governor-General for the stoppage of the slave-trade. We are informed by a correspondent that this petition contained the following passage:—"The slave-trade has accumulated in this island a coloured population of 660,000 souls, of which 498,000 are slaves; and their numerical preponderance over the whites may produce the saddest consequences. The mutinies of Bampa and Ingenio Triumvirito show the disposition for revolt prevailing among the blacks, who are getting more and more excited by their knowledge of the victory of the Haitians, and of the emancipation in Jamaica, from whence emissaries have succeeded in getting to this island, besides the well-known ones sent here by British societies. An English mission, at the head of which is one of the most zealous abolitionists, is now proceeding through the island. This explains why, in the last mutinies, negroes were discovered who were familiar with the English language. Consequently it was urgently necessary that an end should be put to the abominable and dangerous trade in slaves, and the Governor who would effect its suppression would do the greatest possible service to his country. It was true the revolts of Bampa and Triumvirito had been suppressed, but the killing of 300 negroes was a considerable loss to the colonists." The story of the English emissaries in this extract is, of course, a fiction. The negroes who were so familiar with the English language were doubtless of that large number who have been illegally transferred from British islands.

The Philadelphia correspondent of the *Morning Chronicle* furnishes the following extracts:—

"Letters just received from Havana state that there have been negro insurrections on six estates at Cardenas, Cuba. Many lives were lost, but the Government suppresses all the particulars."

"The insurrection in Cuba, says a private letter, is a concerted movement. Planters and overseers are flying into the cities. Many whites have been killed; some of the overseers have been boiled to death in sugar-coppers. Houses have been burnt, and the revolt is spreading. Troops are gone to the disturbed districts."

"The Captain of a vessel arrived at New York from Matanzas, reports that, on the day previous to his sailing, an insurrection had broken out among the slaves on the plantations in the neighbourhood of Matanzas, and it was supposed that their plan of operations had been concerted throughout that part of the island. The people from the country were hastening to the city for protection—great numbers had already arrived. An engineer on one of the sugar plantations had been thrown into one of the sugar boilers and scalded to death. The inhabitants of Matanzas were seriously alarmed. One planter, who had 400 slaves on his estate, had put 100 in irons the day the ship sailed. Several hundred soldiers started in different directions, to endeavour to quell the disturbances."

"This account seems to be confirmed by the following letter, dated

"Matanzas, Feb. 14, 1844."

"There has been a great excitement in the neighbourhood of this and Cardenas, among the planters and indeed all the whites, who fear another revolt among the negroes in this part of the island. There are a thousand reports all the while in circulation, exaggerating the truth. There is, without doubt, great disaffection among the negroes, and some of these tribes of blacks are bold fellows, and would be dangerous if they were organised. They are ignorant of military tactics, and in case of revolt, were the number very large, it would only result in defeat and death to the negroes. The whites on the whole island are equal in number to the blacks; the blacks stand no chance at all, and the oftener they revolt the more severely are they treated."

The *Times* gives the following as from Havana, under date of Feb. 17:—"The Military Commission appointed to investigate into the extent of the late conspiracy of the negroes, and to punish the most criminal, are still pursuing their inquiries. It appears that no white persons are implicated, and as the intentions of the negroes are, by their own declarations, now well known, it may be safely asserted that the mischief is at an end. Meanwhile Government will establish a military force in the interior, which need not be very large, to insure tranquillity. Most of the planters are determined to increase the number of whites on their estates, and immigration, after having been indifferently supported, will now be looked to as the necessary means to insure permanent tranquillity. It is painful to know, that in the midst of this turmoil, a slaver, with 1200 negroes, has arrived on our coast. They have been offered at 340 dollars a head, but our planters are determined to buy no more, and none of this cargo has been disposed of. No one is now inclined to encourage this abominable traffic, which begins to be considered as highly injurious to the welfare of the island. Several corporations and planters have given in reports favourable to the total abolition of the slave trade; it is understood these will be sent forthwith to the Spanish Government. This is a true outline of the present state of things; and the accounts which appear in the papers of the southern states of America are not to be relied on, and excite here general disgust. The only disturbance has been on the side of Matanzas, for everything in the Buelta de Abajo is quiet."

DENMARK.—NEW SLAVE ORDINANCE.—In the *Journal des Débats* we find the following news from Copenhagen, under date the 12th March:—

"The King has issued an ordinance for the purpose of ameliorating the condition of the slave population in St. Croix, St. Thomas, and St. John. The following are the chief points of this ordinance:—

"1. The slave shall be exempt from every species of labour on Sundays and the great fête days, whether civil or religious, until four o'clock in the afternoon; after which hour they may be employed in domestic services, or work of an easy nature. Nevertheless, in cases of extreme urgency, legally proved, the slaves may be employed, under the authorisation of the civil authorities, in cultivation and manufacture such as they are usually called upon to perform.

"2. Considering that the services of the slaves are indispensable to their

masters on market-days and fairs, it is declared that those of them which have hitherto been held on Sunday shall be transferred to the Saturday preceding the days on which they have been individually held.

"3. In the mixed tribunals, composed of magistrates and planters, constituted for the trial of offences committed by slaves, neither the master, nor any other person interested directly or indirectly in the estates to which the slaves may belong, or having any interest whatever in the cultivation of such estates, shall be permitted to sit in judgment on such slaves. Moreover, the slave shall have the right, in future, to appeal from the sentences of these mixed commissioners to the ordinary tribunals of the colonies.

"4. There shall be established at St. Croix, St. Thomas, and St. John, schools for the instruction of adult and infant slaves. The masters shall be required to allow them to resort to those establishments under pain of fines, the amount of which shall be fixed by the tribunals, analogous to those inflicted in the case of whites.

"In the preamble of this ordinance the King expresses the satisfaction which he feels, that the planters of the Danish colonies have readily consented to make the great sacrifices required to enable the government to adopt the foregoing regulations in favour of their slaves."

However short this measure falls of what could be desired, it is satisfactory as indicating movement. The abolition of the Sunday markets and fairs is a great gain to the slaves. The establishment of schools for adults, as well as for infants, is an advantage also; but then one is anxious to know when they will be allowed to attend those schools, the time they will have secured to them for instruction, and the kind of learning that will be imparted. Some advantage will also result from the sabbath being secured to the slaves; though the power given the planters to employ them in cases of urgency may and will be abused. The partial purification of the tribunals is another point in favour of the slaves, coupled as it is with the right of appeal to the ordinary courts; but it would have been wiser and better for the King at once to have decided upon sending the cases of delinquent slaves before an independent tribunal. Impartiality can scarcely be expected from any mixed tribunal, such as that contemplated in the ordinance. Nothing is said about slave evidence, whether it is to be regarded as legal evidence against the master; nor, in case of appeal of the party, who is to bear the expense. It is, however, a step in the right direction; and must, I think, lead to others.

DONATIONS AND SUBSCRIPTIONS.

THE following contributions have been received since our last list was published, and are hereby thankfully acknowledged:—

	Donations.	Subs.
	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Cheltenham Auxiliary	6 10 0	
Exeter Auxiliary	£13 4 6	
Less expenses.....	2 17 9	
Amount remitted	£10 6 9	
Alexander, Daniel	0 10 0	
Davies, Samuel	0 10 0	
Drew, William	1 1 0	
Dymond, Robert	1 1 0	
Dymond, John	0 10 0	
Evans, Richard	0 10 0	
Knott, Thomas	1 1 0	
Lee, William	1 1 0	
Mackintosh, John	0 10 0	
Milward, Thomas	0 10 0	
Small sums	0 7 6	
Sparkes, Sarah	1 1 0	
Sparkes, Rachel	1 1 0	
Sparkes, T. T.	0 10 0	
Treffry, Henry	1 0 0	
Wilkey, J. F.	0 10 0	
Wilkey, Sarah	0 10 0	
Wright, Harriet	1 1 0	
York—Candler, John	(one year and a half)	
Favill, James Copsie	1 1 0	
Fletcher, Caleb	0 10 0	
Fletcher, Martha	(half-year)	
Ford, John	0 10 0	
Harris, Charles	1 1 0	
Rowntree, Joseph	1 1 0	
Scarr, Hannah	0 5 0	
Spence, Joseph	1 1 0	
Tuke, Samuel	1 1 0	
Walker, John	1 1 0	
Waller, Alice	0 10 0	
Waller, Robert	1 1 0	
Williams, Caleb	1 1 0	
Buckingham—Collected by Miss Hatton	2 10 0	
Horsham—Pollard, William	1 1 0	
Aylesbury—Lee, Dr. (Hartwell-house)	1 0 0	
Driffield—Anderson, David	20 0 0	
Chelsea—Place, Richard	1 1 0	
Truro—Hodgson, Maria	2 2 0	
Stourbridge—Zachary, Thomas	3 0 0	
Rochdale—A Friend	3 15 0	
Baldwin, James	0 5 0	
Schofield, Robert	1 0 0	
Bath—Stuart, Capt. Charles	5 0 0	

Printed by WILLIAM TYLER, of 25, Duncan-terrace, Islington, in the county of Middlesex, printer, and CHARLES REED, of Cambridge-heath, Hackney, in the said county of Middlesex, printer, at their printing-office, No. 5, Bolt-court, Fleet-street, in the parish of St. Dunstan-in-the-West, in the city of London; and published by LANCELOT WILD, of No. 13, Catherine-street, in the parish of St. Mary-le-Strand, in the county of Middlesex, publisher, at 13, Catherine-street, Strand, as aforesaid.

Wednesday, April 3, 1844.